

Application No. 10/064,129
Amendment dated November 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2005

RD-28679-1

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the consideration shown by the Office, as evidenced by the Office Action, mailed on August 10, 2005. In the subject Office Action Claims 9-16, 20-22, 26-31, 36-39, 44-47, 52, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 65 and 67 were indicated as being allowed.

Claims 1-6, 18, 23, 32, 35, 40, 43, 48, 51, 56, 58, 62 and 64 have been previously cancelled and new claims 68-84 have been added. In response to the previous Office Action, Applicants inadvertently cancelled claims 1-6, 18, 23, 32, 35, 40, 43, 48, 51, 56, 58, 62 and 64. As such, in the present response Applicants have re-introduced claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 18, 23, 32, 35, 40, 43, 48, 51, 56, 58, 62 and 64 as new claims 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83 and 84 respectively.

Accordingly, claims 7-17, 19-22, 24-31, 33-34, 36-39, 41-42, 44-47, 49-50, 52-55, 57, 59-61, 63, 65-67 and 68-84 are currently pending in the application.

Claim Objections

Claims 7 and 8 were objected to as being dependent upon previously cancelled claim 1. Applicants have introduced new claim 68, which is a reproduction of former claim 1. Applicants have further amended claims 7 and 8 to depend from new claim 68. Therefore, Applicants submit that the objection to claims 7 and 8 have been overcome.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 7, 8, 17, 19, 24, 25, 33, 34, 41, 42, 49, 50, 60, and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuda et al. (US 5,808,409). Matsuda is cited as disclosing a lamp including a tube filled with mercury vapor. The tube is coated with a phosphor blend including among other phosphors $\text{LaPO}_4:\text{Ce}$, Tb , $\text{Gd}_2\text{O}_3:\text{Eu}$ and MgWO_4 .

Applicants submit that amended independent claims 17, 24, 33, 41 and 49 and new independent claims 68, 75, 76, 78, 80 do not recite a phosphor blend where the

Application No. 10/064,129
Amendment dated November 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2005

RD-28679-1

phosphors can be selected from $\text{LaPO}_4:\text{Ce}$, Tb , $\text{Gd}_2\text{O}_3:\text{Eu}$ or MgWO_4 . As such, Applicants submit claims 17, 24, 33, 41, 49, 68, 75, 76, 78, 80 are not anticipated by Matsuda and are allowable. Similarly, due at least in part to their dependence on claims 17, 24, 33, 41, 49, 68, 75, 76, 78, 80, Applicants submit that claims 7-8, 18-19, 25, 34, 42, 50, 60, 66, 69-74, 77, 79 and 81-84 are likewise allowable.

Claims 53 and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Northrop et al. (US 5,122,710). Northrop is cited as disclosing a lamp including a tube filled with mercury vapor. The tube is coated with a phosphor blend including among other phosphors $(\text{Sr}, \text{Ca}, \text{Ba})_5(\text{PO}_4)_3 \text{Cl}:\text{Eu}$ and $\text{Y}_2\text{O}_3:\text{Bu}$. Applicants submit that independent claim 53 as amended does not recite $(\text{Sr}, \text{Ca}, \text{Ba})_5(\text{PO}_4)_3 \text{Cl}:\text{Eu}$ or $\text{Y}_2\text{O}_3:\text{Bu}$. For at least this reason, Applicants submit claim 53 is not anticipated by Northrop and are allowable. Similarly, due at least in part to its dependence on claim 53, Applicants submit that claim 54 is likewise allowable.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested. Allowance of claims at an early date is solicited.

Date: 11/10/05

Respectfully submitted,



Jason K. Klindtworth
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,211

General Electric Company
Building K1, Room 3A65
Niskayuna, New York 12309
Telephone: (518) 387-7360 or
(518) 387-7122